

JUN 27 2006

LAW OFFICES OF
McGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200
VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817
TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100
FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376
E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM / ADMIN @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM
SENDER'S E-MAIL: JHOWARD @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN
PHILLIP E. MILLERT
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDERT
JAMES E. HOWARD†
JOHN J. DRESCH
SCOTT M. TULINO
J. BRADLEY WRIGHT†
DONALD J. LECHER
PETER F. MCGEE†
†MEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA

June 27, 2006

VIA FACSIMILE

To: Examiner Wai Sing Louie
Group Art Unit: 2814
U.S.P.T.O.

Facsimile No.: (571) 273-8300

From: James E. Howard

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76

Re: Enclosed Request for Reconsideration
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/774,389
Docket No.: PTGF-03083

Dear Examiner Louie:

Enclosed for filing is a Request for Reconsideration in response to the Final Office Action mailed on May 15, 2006, which should place the above-referenced case in condition for allowance.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,


James E. Howard

JEH/geb

Enclosures

Total pages transmitted: 8

JUN 27 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

Toshiya Uemura

Serial No.: 10/774,389 Group Art Unit: 2814

Filed: February 10, 2004 Examiner: Wai Sing Louie

For: LIGHT EMITTING APPARATUS

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
Box AF
Alexandria, VA 22313 - 1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Sir:

This paper is in response to the Office Action dated May 15, 2006.

Claims 1-20 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 8 and 16 are independent.

Applicant notes that, notwithstanding any claim amendments herein or later during prosecution, Applicant's intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements.

Claims 1-5, 7, 10-13, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Caracci et al. reference in view of the Slater Jr. et al. reference. Claims 6, 8-9, 14-15, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Caracci et al. reference in view of the Slater Jr. et al. reference and further in view of the Lowery et al. reference.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention as defined by, for example, independent claim 1, is directed to a light emitting apparatus that includes a semiconductor